

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 117

EC 141 533

AUTHOR Layden, Russell G.; Lederer, James B.
 TITLE REACH Program (A Program for Hard to Reach Deaf Students), 1980-1981. Evaluation Report.
 INSTITUTION Bergen County Special Services School District, Paramus, N.J.
 PUB DATE 81
 NOTE 34p.
 EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; Daily Living Skills; Elementary Secondary Education; *Hearing Impairments; Mild Disabilities; Multisensory Learning; Parent Education; *Program Development; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Severe Disabilities; Staff Development

ABSTRACT

The report describes the development and operation of a program to serve two groups of hearing impaired children: students who need a highly structured multisensory curricular approach to the standard curriculum objectives, and students who need a heavy emphasis in life skills and activities for daily living. Monitoring data is presented on project objectives and budgetary information is also included. Excerpts from the third party evaluation report are included which support the need for a two track approach. Further evaluative information is supplied by a discussion of indicators of pupil progress, curriculum development data, staff development data, and parent education data. Among appended information are the plans for staff development, curriculum development, and parent education. (CL)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *



SPECIAL SERVICES SCHOOL DISTRICT OF BERGEN COUNTY
327 EAST RIDGEWOOD AVENUE
PARAMUS, NEW JERSEY 07652

EC

MR. NORMAN A. BLESCHMAN, PRESIDENT
 MRS. VIVIAN CHASKIN, VICE PRESIDENT
 DR. S. DAVID ADLER
 DR. DOROTHY BRYAN
 MR. HAROLD P. DESOCIO
 MR. THOMAS N. OLSEN
 MR. EDWARD SLODOWSKI
 MR. EUGENE WEISS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
 This document has been reproduced as
 received from the person or organization
 originating it.
 Minor changes have been made to improve
 reproduction quality.
 Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
 ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
 position or policy.

DR. RUSSELL G. LAYDEN
 SUPERINTENDENT
DR. JAMES B. LEDERER
 ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT
JOHN DWYER
 BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR
IRMA LEEDS
 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT



ED212117

EVALUATION REPORT

REACH PROGRAM

(A Program for Hard to Reach Deaf Students)

1980-1981

Dr. Russell G. Layden
 Dr. James B. Lederer

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
 MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
 HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

James B. Lederer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
 INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EC141533

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This Evaluation Report has been prepared with the assistance of many fine staff. All are to be commended for their invaluable contribution. This includes:

Miss Mary Ann Mercurio, Program Director for the
Hearing Impaired Program
Mrs. Barbara Strassman, Teacher
Sr. Dorothy Mangan, Teacher
Miss Joanne Russo, Speech Therapist
Mrs. Valerie Mauriello, Speech Therapist
Miss Voula Chelico, Child Study Team Chairperson/Social
Worker
Mrs. Helen Degnan, Learning Disability Teacher Consultant
Mr. William Cantor, Psychologist
Mrs. Aminta Jennings, Aide
Mrs. Geri Sabotello, Aide

The entire staff, parents, and children are to be thanked as well.

Table of Contents

Original Statement of Need.....	1
Program Development Goals.....	1
Program Development Objective.....	1
Program Development and Implementation Timelines.....	2
Program-Based Budget.....	3
Monitoring Report.....	4
Evaluation Report.....	5
Appendix A: Staff Development Plan.....	12
Appendix B: Parent Education Plan.....	13
Appendix C: Curriculum Development Plan.....	14
Appendix D: Identification Criteria and Indicators.....	16

PROGRAM ALTERNATIVES PROPOSAL
FOR THE HEARING IMPAIRED PROGRAM

STATEMENT OF NEED:

In the Spring of 1980 there were 12 students in the Hearing Impaired Program who were seen as being in need of an alternative approach to mastering curriculum objectives. These students appeared to have diverse needs which could be better served in a setting which encouraged greater individualization, alternative modes of communication including a manual component, and significant curriculum adaptation. Two distinct groups of these youngsters were observed. The first group appeared to need a highly structured, multi-sensory curricular approach to the standard curriculum objectives. The second group appeared to need a heavy curricular emphasis in Life Skills and Activities for Daily Living.

Both groups of students were viewed as not maximally benefitting or being able to benefit from the approach applied in our program. They had limited functional communication skills. Their speech intelligibility was also quite limited.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT GOALS:

The original program development goals included:

1. To develop an alternative program to individually serve a group of students who need a multi-sensory, highly structured program.
2. To develop an alternative program to individually serve a group of students who need a Life Skills/Activities for Daily Living program.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES:

The program development objectives included:

1. To delineate student identification criteria and indicators.
2. To screen and identify possible student candidates.
3. To identify staff members.
4. To write a staff development plan.
5. To write a parent education plan.
6. To write a curriculum plan.
7. To present the draft program proposal to the Board of Trustees.
8. To present the proposal to the parents.
9. To refine the program proposal.
10. To disseminate the program packet to the Regional Coordinators and to Local Education Agency/District personnel.
11. To implement the staff development and curriculum development plans.
12. To implement curriculum.
13. To implement parent education plan.
14. To monitor program objectives.
15. To evaluate the program.

PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINES:

<u>Objectives</u>	<u>Due Date</u>
1. Development and refinement of student identification criteria and indicators.....	April 30, 1980
2. Screening and identification of possible student candidates.....	May 9, 1980
3. Identification of staff members.....	May 9, 1980
4. Designing a staff development plan.....	May 12, 1980
5. Designing a parent education plan.....	May 12, 1980
6. Designing a curriculum development plan.....	May 12, 1980
7. Presentation of draft proposal to the Board of Trustees.....	May 13, 1980
8. Presentation of proposal to the parents.....	May 14, 1980
9. Refinement of the program proposal.....	May 21, 1980
10. Dissemination of the program packet to Regional Coordinators and to Districts.....	May 23, 1980
11. Implementation of staff development and curriculum development plans.....	June 1, 1980
12. Implementation of curriculum.....	September 1, 1980
13. Implementation of parent education plan.....	September, 1980
14. Monitoring data gathering.....	September-June 1980-81
15. Third Party Evaluation.....	February, 1981
16. Evaluation.....	July, 1981

PROGRAM-BASED BUDGET:

<u>Line Item</u>	<u>Unit Costs Cited in Appendix</u>	<u>Total Costs</u>
Personnel (Direct Service)		
2 teachers	(no additional cost factor)	
1 teacher assistant	(no additional cost factor)	
.2 music	(no additional cost factor)	
.2 physical education	(no additional cost factor)	
.4 speech	(no additional cost factor)	
.3 Child Study Team	(no additional cost factor)	
*Personnel (Indirect Services)		
staff development plan		\$3020.
parent education plan		\$ 450.
curriculum development plan		\$1430.
Supplies	(no additional cost factor)	
Equipment	(no additional Cost factor)	
Miscellaneous	(no additional cost factor)	
		\$4900.

*1980-1981 expenditures were \$6680.

Monitoring Data

The status of the program is reported in the form of a monitoring checklist to make sure that all that was to take place had taken place.

	<u>Completed</u>	<u>Not Completed</u>
1. To develop an alternative program to individually serve a group of students who need a multi-sensory, highly structured program.	X	
2. To develop an alternative program to individually serve a group of students who need a Life Skills/Activities for Daily Living Program.	X	
3. To delineate student identification criteria and indicators	X	
4. To screen and identify possible student candidates	X	
5. To identify staff members	X	
6. To write a staff development plan	X	
7. To write a parent education plan	X	
8. To write a curriculum plan	X	
9. To present a draft program proposal to the Board of Trustees	X	
10. To present the proposal to the parents	X	
11. To refine the program proposal	X	
12. To disseminate the program packet to the Regional Coordinators	X	
13. To implement the staff development and curriculum development plans	X	X
14. To implement the parent education plan	X	
15. To monitor program objectives	X	

EVALUATION DATA

Program evaluation for the REACH Program has taken place on two fronts. The first front is the summary statement made by the Third Party evaluators. The second front is the summary data which is presented and interpreted in this report.

Third Party Evaluation:

In the third party evaluation the following statements were made--

The two REACH classes serve students with extraordinary language deficits compared to their hearing impaired peers. There is wide variation in the reasons for their difficulties in learning English. In an effort to improve their educational program, the Reach Classes were established in September, 1980. Students in the REACH classes are taught using manual English, a system of communication which employs signs and fingerspelling borrowed from American Sign Language, and used simultaneously with spoken English. Some of the students are delayed in the acquisition of English simply because of their deafness, while others have language learning problems which cannot be accounted for solely on the basis of hearing loss.

The size and staffing of these classes is appropriate. Teachers and students interact and communicate well with each other. The most immediate benefit in improving the instructional program for these students would be realized by increasing classroom space to allow for more hands-on teaching strategies. There needs to be sufficient space to set up learning centers and interest tables. The REACH teachers have a good grasp of the students' needs and understand how to modify and individualize their work. The resources to do this need to be provided.

There will be a continuing need for classes like REACH. One way to view long range planning for these classes is that over a period of years, they will evolve into a separate track at the elementary level. This possibility should be considered in planning possible relocation of HIP.

The maintenance of two tracks, preferably with each in its own facility, may seem unrealistic in light of likely budget reductions which public schools anticipate over the next few years. Nevertheless, the characteristics of the hearing impaired population reflect these needs. While planning for hearing impaired students cannot be done on the basis of degree of hearing loss, because there is considerable overlap of categories, the following generalizations are helpful. Students with:

1. MILD and MODERATE degrees of hearing loss can be served in general education classes assuming they have been identified early, are appropriately amplified, and have adequate support from specialists (usually itinerant teachers of the hearing impaired).

2. SEVERE degrees of hearing loss can often be served in general education classes if they have had the advantages of early training and optimum amplification. They are just as often served in special classes with partial mainstreaming, due to a variety of circumstances which require intensive habilitation efforts in areas of deficit.
3. PROFOUND degrees of hearing loss are typically served in selfcontained classes, although not invariably. The student who is profoundly deaf by audiogram may be sufficiently amplified so that he or she can function auditorily as a student with a moderate or moderate-to-severe hearing loss. Profoundly hearing impaired students who were identified late (after two years of age), who did not have the advantage of early training which developed their residual hearing, are typically placed in classes where manual English is employed. This is because their potential for learning English through the ear and eye combined is limited due to non-functional residual hearing. In other cases, a child who has grown up in a signing environment regardless of degree of hearing loss may have parents who will request that signing be continued as the preferred mode of communication at school. In still other cases, some children of deaf parents will have learned the American Sign Language as their first, and perhaps only, language. Manual English then becomes the vehicle through which the children are taught English.

The necessity of a strong auditory/oral program is obvious in terms of the typical hearing impaired population found in public school programs. Well over 80% of such populations are not profoundly deaf by audiogram, and can have sufficient use of residual hearing to be able to learn English more naturally through the ear and eye combined and at a faster rate than their profoundly deaf counterparts. Among the sub-group of profoundly deaf students are some whose residual hearing and speech reading abilities enable them to learn in an auditory/oral program. The remainder of the group will need the benefit of a manual English program which combines English word-order signing with spoken English. It would seem to follow logically that deaf children of deaf parents would all be candidates for a manual English program. However, some deaf parents prefer an auditory/oral program for their children in order that they receive the speech stimulation they may be missing at home, while other deaf parents want their children in manual English programs in order to maximize the communication foundation which has been established at home. These variables are all significant in offering truly individualized education to hearing impaired students.

In summary, the Third Party Evaluation revealed that there is, indeed, a need for a second track for the youngsters in the HIP. The Evaluation also revealed the high quality of instruction and the high level and extent of individualization. It appears that the evaluators, by inference, are adopting a definition of individualization--one that the District has already adopted: individualization is considered a characteristic of effective instruction if the term implies helping each student to succeed, to achieve a high percentage of correct responses, and to become confident of his or her competence, but this does not mean a method in which a student works alone or on tasks of his or her own choosing. To better achieve goals of individualization a recommendation was also made for the District to look into the utilization of space in order to increase the "hands on" learning center opportunities for the students in the REACH classes.

R.E.A.C.H. Plan:

The second data base for this evaluation has as its reference point the original "Program Alternatives Proposal for the Hearing Impaired" which was submitted to the Board of Trustees as a planning document in the late Spring of 1980. There were four sources of evaluation information in this original planning document. The first source is the pupil progress indicator data. The second source is the curriculum development data. The third source is the staff development data. The fourth source is the parent education data.

Indicators of Pupil Progress

It cannot be fully clear why some students did make progress in certain areas and why some students did not make progress in certain areas. This is so because there were (1) two outstanding teachers (2) an alternative communication methodology (3) an alternative instructional package (4) and a better than average teacher/pupil ratio. Although there are research limitations, there are general findings:

1. the use of signs appears to have resulted in measurable and observable improvement in receptive communication skills and in relative improvement in writing vocabulary.
2. oral speech and listening skills have not improved; in fact, in many situations, listening skills have deteriorated further.
3. reading scores in almost all children have shown improvement; the exceptions have maintained levels with there being no marked pattern among the students; a slight pattern appears in the area of comprehension as a deficit area in the weaker scores.
4. math scores with all but one student showed gain, and some students showed even more than 1 year's gain in the measurement period; computation was, by far, the strength area compared with math concepts.
5. attitude toward self and others showed great changes in that students approach school work in a more positive way, and they are having a greater frequency with experiencing success in the classroom especially with the integrated curriculum model which

makes use of such instructional activities as gardening, wood-working, cooking, and special projects.

When one reviews such findings, one must note that these findings are for students who have not experienced much success in their earlier school careers. There is a consensus that these intermediate aged students are benefitting from the REACH classes.

Curriculum Development Data.

Original curriculum development objectives were designed to focus upon two areas--what works and what is not working. The objectives designed to address what works and is operative included five sub-objectives:

1. to identify what present objectives seem appropriate to the needs of the students as identified.
2. To identify what present activities seem appropriate to the needs of the students as identified.
3. to identify what present instructional methods seem appropriate to the needs of the students as identified.
4. to identify what instructional resources seem appropriate to the needs of the students as identified.
5. to identify what evaluation procedures and instruments presently in use are appropriate for the students as identified.

The curriculum objectives designed to focus upon what is not working and what should be included are encompassed in the following sub objectives:

1. to identify what present objectives seem inappropriate and what objectives would be more appropriate for the students as identified.
2. to identify what present instructional activities seem inappropriate and what instructional activities would be more appropriate for the students as identified.
3. to identify what present instructional methods seem inappropriate and what instructional methods would be more appropriate for the students as identified.
4. to identify what present instructional resources seem inappropriate and what instructional resources would be more appropriate for the students as identified.
5. to identify what evaluation procedures and instruments presently in use are inappropriate and what evaluative procedures and instruments would be more appropriate for the students as identified

Although there was a one week intensive workshop which focused upon curriculum development and the objectives cited above, because of changes in personnel not all of the curriculum development objectives have been attained. All of the objectives have been attained to some degree, but there are objectives which have not been fully attained. It is necessary for us to review the I.E.P.s and the lesson plans and to list all of the objectives which were covered and those yet to be covered.

The objectives which focus upon what works and is operative have generally been attained and are fully reflected in the I.E.P.s for 1981-1982 and in the progress reports throughout the 1980-1981 year. Generally speaking, what has been developed is an integrated curriculum approach with "hands on" activities and use of manual communication including signs, fingerspelling, and spoken English. The curricular emphasis on functional competence appears to be in line with the Goetz, Schuler, and Sailor (1981) definition of functional competence objectives: those responses that produce an immediate consequence for the child, those for which the consequence is potentially reinforcing and in which the consequence is specific to the response, and those in which the response is natural to the child's interaction with the environment.

The objectives which focus upon what is not working have not been fully completed. While it appears clear that concept attainment objectives and many non-generalizable comprehension objectives are at present not being mastered, a decision needs to be made about the most effective manner by which to teach such areas or the appropriateness of teaching such areas. A Life Skills set of objectives as derived from other programs in the District is worthy of investigation for such youngsters at this point in time.

Staff Development Data.

The 1980-1981 staff development objectives focused on the need to increase knowledge and skills in manual communication. The objectives included the need to increase knowledge of manual communication systems and the need to increase the skills, levels of proficiency, and mastery levels of manual communication systems. The activities included a 1 week intensive N.Y.U. workshop, a 6 week intensive N.T.I.D. workshop, and a 9 month on-going in-service workshop. In addition, unscheduled enrichment activities took place through involvement at S.H.I.P. in-service sessions, Millburn in-service sessions, and currently through on-going N.T.I.D. summer enrichment sessions. Evaluation of the scheduled events include attitudinal post-instructional assessment, output narrative assessment, self-evaluation, a desire to continue training, and personnel evaluation. Both teachers including Mrs. Barbara Strassman and Sister Dorothy Mangan attended various sessions. Child Study Team members, the P.E. teacher, and the Art teacher as well as the aides pursued staff development activities. All viewed their skill increase as significant.

The present situation, however, leaves us with a need to re-cycle our efforts in that we will shortly have to begin training again. Through either transfer, retirement, and/or resignation, we need to train three staff-members: 1 REACH teacher; 1 L.D.T.-C: and 1 School Psychologist. However, the linkages are established, and we will need to be prepared to have two entirely different levels of development for REACH personnel.

In addition to the personnel listed and the speech department personnel, there is a need to commend the entire staff for their staff development efforts to disseminate the identification procedures and criteria for REACH candidates. All staffmembers appear to be very sensitive to identification of REACH candidates.

Parent Education Data.

As with staff development, the intent of the parent education program was primarily to provide knowledge and skill in manual communication. The specific objectives were: (1) to increase the knowledge of manual communication systems; (2) to increase the skills, levels of mastery and proficiency, and manual communication interests. To attain these objectives an on-going 9 month workshop was to be established. It was established, and it was viewed as quite successful through the various evaluative measures (post-instructional assessment, output narrative, informal self-evaluation, and stated intent to continue training). Unfortunately not all parents participated leaving the question of how there can be a greater impact upon the parents in the identified objectives.

Summary of Recommendations for 1981-1982

1. continue to provide the high level of support for the Reach program with emphasis on the following:
 - a. staffing
 - b. equipment
 - c. instructional supplies
 - d. physical space
2. continue to provide the curriculum development support
3. continue to provide the staff development support
4. continue to provide the parent education support
5. explore the possibility and feasibility of acquiring wireless units to enable consistent amplification during out-of-class activities
6. explore space utilization options for learning centers
7. identify additional practical experiences for Mathematics and other subject areas
8. based upon achievement data, explore the grouping options for students in the area of Mathematics
9. make greater use of videotape to provide students with feedback in the speech and language as well total communication areas.
10. address the concept attainment and comprehension areas of achievement with an emphasis on (a) motivation through attending, (b) memory training through increased concrete experiences, (c) adding to the array of real life experiences, and (d) making sure that the objectives and instructional activities are "functional" in that they have short-term payoff to the student and that such payoff is directly related to the instructional situation.

Issues to Resolve

1. With the present criteria for screening and identification, there will be only 2 additional students identified for the 1981-82 school year. This leaves two options:
 - (a) expand the public relations efforts so that all local districts can look to see if the REACH PROGRAM is a more appropriate and less restrictive option for students currently placed elsewhere than in the Bergen County Special Services School District.
 - (b) maintain the present level of service.
2. There is also the option of expanding the present criteria for screening and identification so that a dual track program results. To do this would involve:
 - (a) further exploration of the criteria in light of the fact that States and schools which have done this have not really come up with criteria.
 - (b) parental involvement
 - (c) staff and administrative involvement
 - (d) developing a facility utilization plan
 - (e) developing a curriculum plan
 - (f) developing a staff development plan
 - (g) developing a parent education plan
 - (h) identifying budgetary needs if they are different

STAFF DEVELOPMENT PLAN

RATIONALE:

In order to provide the necessary training and skill development of participating staff members, it is necessary to provide for in-service manual communication training of the staff participants.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT GOALS:

1. To provide knowledge of manual communication.
2. To provide skill development in manual communication.
3. To develop in-house trainers of manual communication.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES:

1. To increase the knowledge of manual communication systems.
2. To increase the skills, levels of proficiency, and mastery levels of manual communication systems.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES:

1. 1 week intensive N.Y.U. workshop
2. 6 week intensive N.T.I.D. workshop
3. 9 month ongoing in-service workshop

STAFF DEVELOPMENT COSTS:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------|
| 1. 1 week intensive workshop | |
| unit cost (80./unit)..... | \$ 80. |
| 2. 1 week intensive workshop retreat | |
| unit cost (195./unit x 2 units)..... | 390. |
| 3. 6 week intensive workshop | |
| unit cost (1200./unit)..... | 1200. |
| 4. 9 month ongoing in-service | |
| unit cost (675./unit x 2 units)..... | 1350. |
| | <u>\$3020.</u> |

EVALUATION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS:

1. attitudinal post-instructional assessment
2. output narrative assessment
3. self-evaluation
4. desire to continue training

APPENDIX A:
STAFF DEVELOPMENT PLAN

APPENDIX B:
PARENT EDUCATION PLAN

PARENT EDUCATION PLAN

RATIONALE:

In order to provide the necessary training and skill development of parents of participating children, it is necessary to provide a manual communication program for these parents.

PARENT EDUCATION GOALS:

1. To provide knowledge of manual communication.
2. To provide skill development in manual communication.
3. To develop knowledge of usage of manual communication component of program modification.

PARENT EDUCATION OBJECTIVES:

1. To increase the knowledge of manual communication systems.
2. To increase the skills, levels of mastery and proficiency, and manual communication interests.

PARENT EDUCATION INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES:

1. 9 month ongoing in-service workshop
unit cost (225/unit x 2 units).....\$450.

\$450.

PARENT EDUCATION EVALUATION:

1. attitudinal post-instructional assessment
2. output narrative assessment
3. self evaluations
4. motivational level to continue training

APPENDIX C:
CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PLAN

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT PLAN

RATIONALE:

Curriculum development must take place in order to provide the necessary scope and sequence of objectives, provide for the necessary instructional activities and instructional resources, the pivotal evaluative procedures and instruments as well as for the necessary branching of objectives and appropriate resources and methods.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT GOALS:

1. To refine the present curriculum wherever possible.
2. To add curriculum objectives where needed.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES:

A. What Works and Is Operative

1. To identify what present objectives seem appropriate to the needs of the students as identified.
2. To identify what present instructional activities seem appropriate to the needs of the students as identified.
3. To identify what present instructional methods seem appropriate to the needs of the students as identified.
4. To identify what present instructional resources seem appropriate to the needs of the students as identified.
5. To identify what evaluation procedures and instruments presently in use are appropriate for the students as identified.

B. What Is Not Working and What Should Be Included

1. To identify what present objectives seem inappropriate and what objectives would be more appropriate for the students as identified.
2. To identify what present instructional activities seem inappropriate and what instructional activities would be more appropriate for the students as identified.
3. To identify what present instructional methods seem inappropriate and what instructional methods would be more appropriate for the students as identified.
4. To identify what present instructional resources seem inappropriate and what instructional resources would be more appropriate for the students as identified.
5. To identify what evaluation procedures and instruments presently in use are inappropriate and what evaluative procedures and instruments would be more appropriate for the students as identified.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES:

1. 1 week intensive curriculum development workshop focusing on objectives A 1-5.
2. 9 month curriculum development activities focusing on objectives B 1-5.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT COSTS:

1. 1 week intensive workshop
(unit cost (1080/unit).....\$1080.
2. 9 month activities.....-----
3. N.T.I.D. consultancy
(unit cost (100/unit x 2 units +travel)..< \$ 350.

Curriculum Development Plan continued

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT COSTS continued....:

\$1430.

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION:

1. Self evaluation of staff.
2. Monitoring of pupil progress
3. Administrative evaluation.
4. Consultant evaluation

APPENDIX D:
IDENTIFICATION CRITERIA AND INDICATORS



SPECIAL SERVICES SCHOOL DISTRICT OF BERGEN COUNTY

CHILD STUDY TEAM

WASHINGTON SCHOOL
BERGEN AVENUE
NEW MILFORD, NEW JERSEY 07646

VOULA CHELICO
CHAIRMAN - SOCIAL WORKER

WILLIAM CANTOR
PSYCHOLOGIST

HELEN DEGNAN
LEARNING CONSULTANT

265-4815
265-6603

DR. RUSSELL G. LAYDEN
SUPERINTENDENT

DR. JAMES B. LEDERER
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT

JOHN DWYER
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR

IRMA LEEDS
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

265-6300

April 29, 1980

TO: Staff, Hearing Impaired Program

FROM: Mary Ann Mercurio and Child Study Team

RE: Criteria for Other Option Program

Criteria for Other Option Program

In accordance with our procedure for any placement change for a student, prime importance is always given to staff input. Therefore, we are requesting that you fill out the attached form on all students who might meet the criteria listed below for consideration as appropriate candidates for the REACH Program.

Two distinct classes will be formed and the qualitative difference between the two will be that Group I will be more academically oriented and Group II will be more oriented to a Life Skills/Activities for Daily Living curriculum

VC:jl

cc: Dr. Russell G. Layden
Dr. James B. Lederer

Group I
Academically-Oriented

1. Age 10 years+ with a cut-off date of the starting date of each school year.
2. Average IQ based on psychological tests which are basically non-verbal types of instruments.
3. No serious learning disabilities.
4. Some progress has been noted in the yearly administration of the SAT's and teacher observation/judgement. *
5. Cognitively intact (no inter-test scatter)
6. Receptive/Expressive Language Difficulties *
 - a. Speech intelligibility - non-intelligible by people familiar with the youngster.
 - b. Were unable to benefit from the current language approach, and were already using some modification of such.
 - c. Limited oral and written development as indicated by samples. --
 - d. Poor syntactic and lipreading abilities as evidenced by scores on Test of Syntactic Abilities, Craig Lip Reading, etc.
7. Limited exposure to oral English in the home.
8. Adaptive abilities intact - social behavior is appropriate based on formal assessment, such as Vineland Social/Maturity Scale and/or staff input. *

Group II
Life Skills/Activities for Daily Living

1. Age 10 years+ with a cut-off date of the starting date of each school year.
2. Borderline to average IQ based on a formal assessment OR functionally retarded.
3. Additional severe learning weakness and deficits. (formal test scatter)
4. Little progress has been noted in the yearly administration of the SAT's and teacher observation/judgement. *
5. Possible neurological involvement
6. Receptive/Expressive Language Difficulties *
 - a. Speech intelligibility - non-intelligible by people familiar with the youngster.
 - b. Were unable to benefit from the current language approach, and were already using some modification of such.
 - c. Limited oral and written development as indicated by samples.
 - d. Poor syntactic and lipreading abilities as evidenced by scores on Test of Syntactic Abilities, Craig Lip Reading, etc.
7. Limited exposure to oral English in the home.
8. Adaptive abilities intact and/or need development - social behavior might be "below what one would expect from a youngster with same C.A." on the Vineland Social/Maturity Scale. *



SPECIAL SERVICES SCHOOL DISTRICT OF BERGEN COUNTY

Program for the Hearing Impaired

WASHINGTON SCHOOL
BERGEN AVENUE
NEW MILFORD, NEW JERSEY 07646

MARY ANN MERCURIO
PROGRAM DIRECTOR
265-4780

DR. RUSSELL G. LAYDEN
SUPERINTENDENT
JOHN DWYER
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR
IRMA LEEDS
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
265-6300

EVALUATION FORM
FOR
CANDIDATES TO REACH PROGRAM

Date: _____

Name of student: _____

Date of Birth: _____ Age as of September _____ day _____ year

Sending School District: _____ County: _____

Teacher fills out: (Teacher's name: _____)

I. Please assess student's progress to date in following areas: Include grade level of functioning regardless of level text used.

1. Speech intelligibility

2. Receptive language

3. Written language ability (You may attach a sample)

4. Reading

5. Math

II. Have you noticed any specific weaknesses in the classroom situation which might be due to learning disabilities. Explain.

III. From your knowledge of this student, has there been previous concern regarding progress (duration of concern)?

IV.(1) Is the student's social and emotional behavior appropriate given his age and handicap? Explain.

(2) How does the student handle frustration? Explain - acting-out, withdraw, etc.

(3) How does student interact with:

a. peers

b. adults and authority figures

(4) What is student's work habit, motivation level, attention span, etc.?

(5) Any other information that might be helpful for a better understanding of student's social, emotional development.

V. In your contact with parents, do you feel they are supportive of student. Are there any specific parental concerns? Explain.

Speech Department fills out: (Therapist's name: _____)

1. Does the child have some form of communication - if so, what level?

2. Intelligibility

3. Level of motivation in communication (persistence in getting message across).

4. Written language - (syntax) (sample may be included)

5. Speech reading ability

6. What do you see as this child's ultimate mode of communication?

7. Include all test results available to date

8. Curriculum in use: speech/language

Additional Service Areas

Physical Education:

(Teacher's name: _____)

Art:

Teacher's name: _____)

1. Any coordination difficulties: (gross/fine motor)

2. Behavior in art and gym

3. Any subjective information that might be helpful in understanding this student.

Child Study Team fills out:

4. LDT-C impressions - Explain

5. Psychologist's impression - Explain

6. Social Worker's impressions - Explain

7. Team impressions and recommendation (includes Program Director)